

inappropriate to do it until after the congressional recess. Now we are told, well, maybe after Memorial Day. Justice is being delayed and justice is being denied because some people are unwilling to make the hard choices, the hard choices that demand that an independent counsel act without political bias to evaluate these charges, to decide whether they have merit.

Anyone, be they old or new, ought to support that very old concept of impartial justice. Looking at these charges, seeing that they are resolved only through an independent counsel will that be done and we need that action immediately.

FOREIGN AID

(Mrs. WALDHOLTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Warren Christopher said in January of this year, "The current structure of the foreign affairs agencies developed in a world much different from today's. It must change to meet the demands of the next century." He was right. And that is exactly what we are beginning today.

Today we begin the debate on the American Overseas Interests Act which will streamline the maze of foreign aid bureaucracies, reduce foreign aid spending and help set new priorities. It is also an important part of the Republican commitment to balance the budget in a way that makes sense.

Under our plan, three foreign aid bureaucracies and dozens of programs are eliminated and reformed, and we save \$21 billion over the next 7 years while continuing to meet our commitments to our friends and allies.

As every aspect of the budget comes under scrutiny, foreign aid, however well-intentioned, cannot be excluded. We need to reexamine how and why every dollar is spent, setting new priorities for a new world. I look forward to a debate that can only improve our foreign aid programs.

OUTSIDE COUNSEL NEEDED IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the House Ethics Committee has refused to hire an outside counsel to investigate the five ethics charges against the Speaker. Without an outside counsel, the ethics charges will have to be investigated by House Members. That means we will have politicians investigating politicians.

Being a former law enforcement officer, I believe, and I have always voted, that professional law enforcement officials should do investigations of other Members of this House, not politicians. Five dark clouds of doubt hang over this Chamber. Let us have a special

outside counsel to investigate the ethics charges hanging over the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we need an outside counsel to do a professional investigation, not politicians. Let us remove the five dark clouds of doubt and appoint a special outside counsel now.

FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, today the House will take up consideration of this country's foreign aid authorization bill in which we establish our foreign policy priorities.

Last year as I campaigned throughout Georgia's Eighth District, I heard from folks who are very concerned about the amount of money we spend overseas while we have so many problems here at home, and I share that concern.

Mr. Speaker, for those residents of central and south Georgia and for all citizens of this country, the new majority has shown its commitment to taking a fresh look at everything the Government does. Foreign aid is no exception. This bill today moves us in the right direction and will cut \$1 billion from foreign aid spending in the upcoming budget.

We must not lose sight, however, of the very real and numerous threats around the world to the freedoms we enjoy. As a member of the Committee on National Security, I have seen those threats. True, the cold war is over but the world has not magically become a safe place.

For the first time in many years, this foreign aid bill today represents a measured attempt to prioritize our influence and interests abroad. The United States is truly the leader of the world and our foreign aid policy must reflect that role by supporting our friends and deterring our foes. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

OUTSIDE COUNSEL NEEDED IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, last week on this floor I was told by the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, that as a freshman I should learn the rules. This weekend I have been studying and what I have studied has discouraged me a lot.

What I have found is that, according to the Washington Post, all five Republican members of the Ethics Committee broke with 15 years of bipartisan tradition and voted unanimously to block an independent outside counsel to investigate the charges that have been leveled against Speaker GINGRICH.

We need to go back to the way the Democrats did it. Under Democratic

leadership, the Ethics Committee has appointed an outside counsel to investigate every major ethics case since 1979. I urge the Ethics Committee to do the same in this case. What is to be hidden? What is to be gained? If there is nothing there, let an outside counsel clear the air.

TRIBUTE TO LES ASPIN

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, America lost a real public servant this last weekend in the death of Les Aspin.

Les Aspin was a young man. He was only 56 years old. He served 22 years of those 56 years here in the Congress. He was also our Secretary of Defense.

He was a summa cum laude at Yale, he attended Oxford, and MIT, so not only did he have a great deal of political savvy but he was also very much academically gifted. From his first close race against a person by the name of LaFollette, a magic name in Wisconsin, to the time he left to become Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin never lost a single political race.

I remember the first time I was here on the floor with an amendment, Les Aspin helped me get the amendment passed. In an age when the Pentagon got everything it wanted, there was one person who started to holler, "No, halt," and that was Les Aspin. "Let's take a closer look," he would say, "at defense spending."

Mr. Speaker, we in this House have not only lost a good friend but we have also lost a true public servant. Not only has America lost a good public servant and we in Congress, but also Marquette University, because Marquette is where he started teaching and Marquette is where he worked when he passed away.

It is only appropriate that Marquette will be the place on Friday where we will say our last good-bye to Les Aspin. America truly has lost a wonderful public servant.

TIME FOR AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL IN SPEAKER'S ETHICS CASE

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, why is the Ethics Committee making the special exception in the case of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH?

In every single high-profile ethics case since 1979, both the Democrats and the Republicans on the committee have voted to appoint an outside counsel. But last Sunday, according to the Washington Post, all five Republican members of the Ethics Committee broke with 15 years of bipartisan tradition and voted to make a special exception for NEWT GINGRICH and block an outside counsel.

Mr. Speaker, these are all honorable people caught in a difficult position because they all have close personal ties to the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Committee has had this since last December. It will never get resolved any other way.

It is not just DAVE BONIOR and others here who are calling for it. Public Citizen, the New York Times, Richard Phelan, Roll Call, Robert Scheer in the L.A. Times, Al Hunter in the Wall Street Journal, Common Cause, the Hartford Courant, the San Francisco Chronicle, the list goes on and on. The Atlanta Constitution, his home newspaper. All have called for an independent outside counsel. It is time that we had one.

A STREAMLINED BUT UNCOMPROMISED FOREIGN AID BILL

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, since the start of the 104th Congress, Republicans have made no attempt to hide our conviction that the Federal Government has grown out of proportion to its responsibilities. The conviction is not limited to domestic programs.

Just as spending at home has come under intense scrutiny, our spending habits abroad should not escape notice.

Although foreign aid is only a small part of the budget, it still consumes billions of dollars. Republicans will streamline this part of the budget, and insure every penny going overseas is wisely and responsibly. We propose to eliminate repetitive bureaucracy by closing three agencies and ending dozens of useless, silly named programs like the Permanent International Association of Road Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, while our plan streamlines, it does not compromise America's position of world leadership. We can only be the world's leader if we do what is right by our future and by our children, and that is the essence of our plan.

TERM LIMITS

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, after the Supreme Court ruled yesterday on the issue of term limits, you heard a lot of complaining.

One who protested the loudest was the distinguished majority leader.

In fact, Mr. ARMEY promised that a vote on term limits would be the first vote in the next Congress.

In January 1997—if he is reelected—Mr. ARMEY will get sworn in for his seventh term, then turn around and vote for a bill that says that serving more than six terms is hazardous to the political health of our Nation.

If you think term limits is such a good idea, here is the solution: Here is a map of Washington.

Here is the Capitol. Here is the airport.

It is a short drive, and parking is a breeze because Members of Congress still have that perk.

From there, you can go back to the Sixth District of Georgia, the Eighth District of Florida, or anywhere else where someone got elected by talking about term limits.

Remember, my friends on the other side of the aisle—the Supreme Court decision will not bar you from acting honorably, from following through on your campaign promises and Republican rhetoric.

That decision is still in your hands.

TERM LIMITS IS NOT DEAD

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Washington Post we read that the former Speaker of this House, Tom Foley, believes that term limits is dead. Actually that should be term limits are dead.

Either way, so speaks the man who did not understand the term limits movement when he was the Speaker, and he still does not get it. The citizens of Washington State and 21 other States passed term limits, and they are not ready to concede defeat on the issue.

Yes, yesterday's decision by the Supreme Court shows an unfortunate disconnect between the judicial branch and the majority of Americans who favor term limits. That type of thing has happened before and Congress has fixed it. Now it is up to Congress to act.

The ruling gives us a clear course: the term limit constitutional amendment. We have seen the arrogance of power here resulting from a system where longevity, not merit, determines clout. Let's return to the idea of citizen legislators who go to Washington to serve and then go back home to live among the people that they have worked for. That is what the people want, and they are the people we work for.

REPUBLICAN MEDICARE CUTS HURT RURAL AMERICA

(Mr. HILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Medicare plan places a major burden on rural America which will literally squeeze the lifeblood out of America's rural hospital system.

Almost 10 million American citizens who live in rural America depend on the Medicare benefits they receive to stay healthy. Under the Republican Medicare plan, significant cuts in Medi-

care revenue will cause a great number of rural hospitals to either close or increase their cost.

It is wrong to make rural America pay such a high price. My Republican colleagues say all they are doing is shifting the cost to the private sector. What they really mean is that they are shifting the cost back to the taxpayers who have already paid that cost through monthly deductions.

Rural America deserves good health care and good hospitals. That is why the Republican plan must be defeated.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CLOSES DOOR OF OPPORTUNITY

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, most American families cannot leave their children a fortune. What we try to leave them is a set of values and an opportunity.

Last week, the Republican budget resolution closed the door of opportunity for millions of American kids. The Republican budget resolution cut college student loans by \$18 billion. That is right. At a time when America needs a well-educated generation to lead us into the next century, at a time when our kids need the opportunity for education for a good-paying job, the Gingrich Republicans make the biggest cut in student loans in our Nation's history.

And why have the Republicans done this? Why are the Republicans increasing a student's cost of financing a college education by an average of \$5,000? Because the Republican student loan cuts fill the Republican piggy bank to pay for tax breaks for the privileged few.

Cutting college student loans may be the GINGRICH view of America. How does your family feel?

THE FOREIGN AID BILL

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, today and through tomorrow and the next day, the House takes up a historic foreign affairs bill that for the first time in many, many years actually authorizes the spending that we take on behalf of the interests of the U.S. policies in respect to foreign lands.

There will be much debate as to whether we are doing it the way other people wish us to do it or we are cutting too deeply, but the fact of the matter is that less than 1 percent of our entire budget is invested in foreign affairs. That is the issue we need to begin to take to the American people.

It surprises me when you ask Americans what they think is the largest item in the Federal budget and they consistently say foreign affairs, and indeed it is perhaps the smallest. When